

Film Score Blogs by Bill Wrobel
Sunday, October 17, 2004 at 3:pm [Blog #10]

I must've been quite tired after ten-hour days at work this week: I slept ten hours this last morning! Monday (Columbus Day holiday) was the last active film music research day during my two-week vacation when my wife and I went with permission to Paramount where I spent a bit over two hours on the photo-stats of Herrmann's *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (see Blog # 9 below). It was a great day to end a long research period, although I wish I had more time to be able to visit Columbia, UCSB, and other fine places to research film scores. Columbia would've been good to return to since I wanted to continue my study of the Jarre score *Lawrence of Arabia* and also Rozsa's score for the Bogart vehicle (in this case, a tank!) titled *Sahara*. Malcolm Arnold's score for *Heroes of Telemark* would be good to look at since few of his scores are readily available for study here in America. His *The Bridge on the River Kwai* is at Columbia but only the "March" (adaptation I believe).

An enthusiast of Arnold's music e-mailed me about the hand-copied notes I made (at UCLA) of Arnold's *Cowboy In Africa* feature film, also known as *Africa—Texas Style!* He called the movie a poor man's *Hatari*. The movie is not densely (as in an African jungle!) scored, as I surmised when I looked at the score available to me. Only several were there, and they were apparently most of the score. Some of the later action cues were not in Box 8 of the General Music Corp Collection 034 (where the scored was inventoried). I can check to see if by chance the rest of the Arnold score is in an adjacent box.

Other interesting cues to check at Columbia would be *Jubal* (composed the year I was born) and *Love Has Many Faces* both by Raksin (who passed away very recently). Also his *City Without Men* is there. I never watched or heard any of those three films. Perhaps they'll be aired on Turner Classic Movies (the movies are not available on dvd). *Arizona* by Victor Young might be interesting, although once again I need to see the film. Mancini's full score to *Experiment in Terror* would be good to study. As given below in an earlier blog, I worked a bit of his *Charade* and *Peter Gunn* of that overall genre or character of music, but the full score was not available there at UCLA in the Henry Mancini Collection.

Now: I had almost no time for film music concerns the last several days due to my ten-hour days at work. I had a few minutes to check some Internet sites, including various film music discussion forums. The most active ones are the Film Score Message Board, Talking Herrmann, Rozsa Forum, Filmus-L, and a few others.

Some posts lately were getting somewhat mean-spirited (or otherwise strange!), unfortunately. There were disturbing forces going on this last week (and still continuing even from last evening). Separate threads designed specifically for flaming were created, ego-inflated legal/tribunal threats or implications made, etc. Such displays on a public forum are regretful, but one sees it periodically. Sometimes you see very infrequently

(thankfully!) posts by individuals who are obviously mentally ill and who also use profanity to make their points (and obviously that approach will never be successful in winning over reasonably-minded readers!). It's not a good place to visit when you encounter too much animosity. Basically the best advice is: If it is no longer fun to be there (or at least no longer constructive), then do not go there anymore. There are other, far better, things to do (such as listen to film music!).

So some of the discussion forum threads have been far less than wholesome lately! :)

I've given it some thought over the last few days as I walked my route and came up with several observations that I would now like to remark on (in terms of general principles):

I noted how devoid of humor those angry/sarcastic posters are. Deadly serious! This in itself would indicate some sort of lack of balanced perspective on their part. They are, in a sense, hypnotized in their myopic perspective. They do not see clearly. Moreover, they engage in an attacking/sarcastic mode of behavior, overtly putting down the object of their displeasure, or even threatening them in at least a veiled manner (usually in the standard "Don't mess with me because I am no one to be reckoned with" or some such ego-strutting). Or they may simply state, in effect, "Well, I'm not going to read the other person's reply anyway." There is no balanced or reasonable approach or healthy discussion.

If, say, you are under attack by someone of a verbal and accusatory nature, I recommend you take that old advice I heard long ago: What other people think about you is none of your business! Besides, what they have to say about you or their dislike of something has far more to do about how they feel about *themselves* than how they feel about you or the subject under discussion. It shows *their* character or beliefs, not yours. Their actions speak far louder than their words. Whenever they direct aggressiveness overtly against a particular individual, they don't have to face themselves. As long as they point to you and insist, "You are the cause of my misery!" they do not have to face themselves. They do not take self-responsibility and eventual self-mastery for their own reactions to life and people they encounter. Instead they project their dissatisfactions and blame others or life in general. They feel quite justified in their beliefs because they feel they are right and adamant to prove a point. By directly arguing with them (and thereby trying to prove your own ego points), this will set up even more resistance and entrenched held views. Arguments do not usually alter the opinions of either side of a dispute but only tend to intensify the fixed emotionally (like unresolved grudges) powering the beliefs. And most egos are too preoccupied being defensive about how they are being treated according to their standards. You inadvertently "touch their buttons," say, and they become offended and go into an attack mode.

I'm reminded of that funny Pee Wee Herman (not Herrmann!) movie scene where one person says to Pee Wee, "You're an idiot!" and Pee Wee retorts, "I know you are but what am I?!" and it just keeps intensifying! Therefore you can't afford to jump into that game because it's like quicksand that will quickly sink you in deeper, and what you say

in a flaming manner will only later haunt you or get back to you in some way, and you'll regret your words. It takes two to fight.

So how can you help people who *believe* (not necessarily based on truth or fact but on their own faulty assessments) that you are making them miserable, aggravated, unhappy? Answer: You leave them alone! That's the best help. They will believe what they want to believe, and any help or understanding that they may gain will most certainly not come from you (the object of their projection)! Take it for granted, say, that they are having a bad week or nursing a grudge, that they should be left alone and that they will work it out and find their own way. Stay away from them. This is common sense psychology. Exhibit toleration, not a counter-attack, because it'll get back to you and hurt you. Do not argue tit for tat because that's again trying to "prove a point". Use reason instead.

Philosophically speaking, it is best to be at a state where you're indifferent to attack or general "bad time" at that stage of life. I am far from being a religious person (! :) but I remember the New Testament advice, "Resist Not Evil" in the book of Matthew. It makes psychological sense because an attacker's words have no real power ("sticks & stones..."). A goal is to learn to be indifferent to such opinions. Why take offense? Your responsibility is to master your own conduct, emotions, and thoughts. Letting others vent off and blow off steam is ok. And criticism can be quite good. You learn how to do something better due to another's perspective or knowledge. For example, someone remarked to me that when I write I should separate long paragraphs into smaller ones so that it's more readable, and space the paragraphs. That's constructive criticism that is given or taken, and that can be helpful. But criticism that is done in the spirit of criticism and putting down is not helpful.

Anger and undue criticism is a person's own internal displeasure based upon his or her demands of how other people should behave: "You should act the way I want you to act." Anger says, "You're not ok and I'm going to put you down" or simply demands, "You must be different than what you are." Sometimes if a grudge is behind it, then there may even be a desire to punish ("I'll show you!" or "I don't get mad, I get even!").

Remember that you have no responsibility to live up to the ideals of another person but to joyfully move towards your own ideals! You have no responsibility to be what someone else wants you to be. You must become more yourself, not more someone else's conception of what you should be or should do. Let him materialize his own standards and ideals, and leave you to materialize your own! Your only responsibility is being yourself to the best of your ability, learning to be your best self thru trial and error. Life on this plane is a learning experience. I'll always remember what a neighbor once told my wife many years ago. She saw he looked dejected about something (probably about his relationship with his girlfriend) and asked him what happened. He answered, "Living and learning, Stephanie! Living and learning!" Very true!

Another saying that has a ring of truth that I learned from somebody long ago is, "If they're not family, let them go. Don't worry about it." Family comes first. Don't let

non-family individuals disturb your equilibrium. They're not worth it, he said. Family first, close friends next, acquaintances a distant third, and strangers last. Ideally it is family that cares about your feelings, and you their feelings.

Besides, just because a critic's idea of reality (and perception of you) is limited, why should you limit yours? Their appraisal of a situation is most likely tainted, prejudiced, or certainly based on their own belief system. They need to examine the nature of their own beliefs. So leave them alone. Besides, everyone has his or her own built-in defense and energy, so the attacker's criticism cannot hurt you. If it does hurt you, then you have given it power (projection). Your own opinions and beliefs about your own life are far more important than anyone else's opinions and beliefs about you. They may not like or agree with what you do, but people are free to live their own lives as they see fit. But if you accept another person's standards as more valid than your own, then it is detrimental. If you think you need to please others (based on their standards), it is detrimental. You are, in certain terms, your own authority.

So [paraphrasing Seth here] whenever you meet someone, king or pauper, who says that you are "evil" (not good enough, of bad character, etc.), then run as fast as you can! Whenever anyone tries to make you feel less than you are, and make you believe in your deficiencies rather than encourage your strengths and abilities, then run as fast as you can! You can tell them "Leave me alone" and then do your creative thing, but be watchful of such people (usually power/controlling/critical types) and let them be. Usually power types are offended when someone defies their will. Those who speak to you in terms of guilt and say you should be what they think you should be, ignore them. Say "Thank you" or "Have a nice day!" and let them go. It does no good, as given earlier, to directly confront them. Take their criticism and playfully throw it out the window and let it bounce around for a while!

Now, it's perfectly okay to say, "You annoy me!" when someone annoys you. That's a natural method of communication. There is nothing wrong with saying, "You're a jerk!" to someone whom you think deserves to hear that. But how sure are you? Philosophically speaking, are you sure you can safely point the finger at him or her because he or she is making your life miserable, or is it your perception or belief that may actually be erroneous once you start thinking seriously about it? And while you may have the freedom to say, "Jerk!" to someone, it can easily become "license" (not true freedom) if it escalates into harmful actions. Self-responsibility or self-mastery (an ideal or higher goal) means that you realize that it's not how other people treat you that are important (because that's ultimately an ego-trip) but how you react or respond to other people and life's circumstances. You can react badly or respond constructively. Each of us will always meet self thru others. They may purposefully or (usually) inadvertently "touch your buttons," but self-mastery means you yourself are responsible for your own reactive actions. The moment you experience anger and frustration, who is the person that really suffers? Answer: yourself. You suffer because you stop experiencing joyfulness. Ultimately, life is a perceptual experience. You are what you focus on, concentrate on. This is immutable law.

Now: A good temper is important, I think. Telling someone to “Go to blazes!” after cutting you off on the road that could’ve resulted in an accident is natural. I heard when I was a kid the expression, “Be mad, but sin not.” I also heard, in effect, “One without a temper is in bad shape, but one who can’t control his temper is in still worse shape!” I know because, astrologically speaking, I have Mars square Uranus, and I had to learn things about the spontaneous expression of anger! But I would get mad and not hold grudges because I had already expressed my hurt or took steps to go around the other person’s impediment. But the tendency to rule, to be dictatorial (instead of engaging in a 50-50 proposition) shows an over-bearing attitude, over-lording over others, and usually this shows in sarcastic speech.

Ideally (in an ideal world, not necessarily the “real” world!), we should magnify the virtues and minimize the faults of others and ourselves. This makes good psychological sense. An old saying is, in effect: “There is so much good in the worst of us, and so much bad in the best of us, it doesn’t behoove any of us to speak evil of the rest of us.” I think this is true (we are all human!). Ideally speaking, it is best to “think twice before you speak once.” Also ideally (perhaps, or debatable), while there are differences of opinion, choose rather those ideas where you can agree, and don’t argue those things where you don’t agree. I guess this comes partly from the Golden Rule: Do unto others, as you would have others do unto you. The Silver Rule, inversely, is: “Don’t do unto others what you wouldn’t want others to do unto you” These are ideals that all of us fail now & then (or a lot!), and it takes a life of constant “living and learning” experiences to remind us of the consequences of our actions on the so-called “Path To Perfection” (as the Theosophists are fond of describing it).

Speaking of theosophists, I studied many of Geoffrey Hodson’s books. He was a fine theosophist who wrote excellent books such as “The Christ Life From Nativity To Ascension.” I am not a theosophist, but I studied it in great depth starting in the mid-Eighties. [I’m eclectic, so I studied various astrological models, Theosophy, Seth/Jane Roberts, Edgar Cayce, etc] In one of his books, he talked about the “art of receiving attacks.” He was basically British of the Old School, so he was a “tempered” man but not necessarily a Brit with a tight upper lip!

Anyway, he advised (1) no reaction of ill will towards the attacker; (2) no feeling of hurt, injury, or injustice since the attacker is simply an instrument or manifestation of your own karma; (3) no reply until reasonable detachment and calm is established; (4) if you are clearly in the wrong, acknowledge it and right the wrong; (5) try to see the other person’s point of view. He stated that the ideal reaction is to become ice-cold, the mind set in pure reason by getting detached and gaining perspective, being logical and exact, and hold emotions in check. I do not necessarily agree with all of this, especially with the emotions since the Puritan ethic in the old Brit (and Gnostic) standard was to overtly suppress feelings because the mind was considered “superior.” Emotions are a part of your being and need to be expressed or acknowledged as you feel them. Basically he was stating not to be “emotional” and then engage in defamatory speech. Philosophically, he discussed how that once you defend yourself, you automatically enter *Maya* (illusion)—the *Maya* that you can be hurt by another’s comments, the *Maya* of the ego that feels

slighted, and so forth. Then he talks about the ideals of harmlessness (towards self and others) and of service (giving your best).

Anyway, I think I pretty much exhausted this topic! I may occasionally indulge in such philosophical monologues now and then (I have a very active Sagittarius-9th house!). So you can skip it if you do not want to read it! Hopefully, however, you can have some *fun* with the site. The astrology papers are Off-Topic papers because I do not wish to go thru the trouble of creating a separate site just for a few occasional astrology papers. The blogs are primarily film music related, but I believe in spontaneous “off-topic” remarks as spirit (and circumstances) moves me. Ideas seek expression, and I will get those ideas “out of my system” to free up other focuses.

I bid you ALL a fine good evening! [7:28 pm]
